



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/550,236	06/27/2006	Giovanni Servadei	377/9-2140	2239

28147 7590 02/11/2008  
WILLIAM J. SAPONE  
COLEMAN SUDOL SAPONE P.C.  
714 COLORADO AVENUE  
BRIDGE PORT, CT 06605

EXAMINER
----------

GERRITY, STEPHEN FRANCIS

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3721

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

02/11/2008

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/550,236	<b>Applicant(s)</b> SERVADEI ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Stephen F. Gerrity	<b>Art Unit</b> 3721	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 November 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 9-14 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 9-14 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 23 September 2005 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)          | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)          | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

## DETAILED ACTION

### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claims 9-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Simon **(DE 19521924)**.

The Simon reference discloses in figure 11 a cap closing machine which includes: a chuck (14); a motor (13); means for torque detecting (23); and a control unit (21) connected to the torque detector to verify the reaching of a threshold value -- see the machine translation of the reference attached to the previous Office action. The Simon reference discloses that the torque detector is a transducer. The containers (11) each arrive with a cap (12) from an unseen cap feeding station via conveyor (18), and at the cap closing station the motor (13) screws the cap (12) onto the container (11). The angle of rotation is measured using sensor (15) and the torque is detected using sensor (23), and these sensors send electrical signals to the controller (21). As stated in the machine translation, the motor is actuated for a number of turns (by use of the angle of rotation sensor), and the torque is detected to determine if the threshold value is reached or exceeded. Note that claims 9 and 11 make use of alternative language, and it is only necessary for the prior art to satisfy one of the conditions of the alternative

claim language; it is not necessary for the prior art to satisfy both conditions of the alternative claim language.

3. Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Spatz et al. **(US 5,321,935)**.

The Spatz et al. reference discloses in the figure a cap closing machine which includes: a chuck (5); a motor (9); means for torque detecting (15); and a control unit (19) connected to the torque detector to verify the reaching of a threshold value.

#### **Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103**

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 9, 10 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Spatz et al. **(US 5,321,935)** in view of Simon **(DE 19521924)** and further in view of applicant's admitted prior art.

In the previous Office action the examiner stated that Official Notice was taken that a technique of moving a container to a cap feeding station where a cap is placed on a threaded end of the container, followed by taking the container together with the cap to a closing station where the cap is screwed to the container is notoriously old and well known in the packaging art. Applicant did not challenge the examiner's taking of Official Notice and accordingly the subject matter is deemed to be applicant's admitted prior art.

The Spatz et al. reference meets all of applicant's claimed subject matter with the exception of how the cap is fed to the container. In Spatz et al. the cap is placed in the chuck by the use of a pick method (see col. 4, line 5) at the location of closing, whereas the claimed method requires moving the container to a cap feeding station followed by taking the container together with the cap to a closing station where the cap is screwed to the container. The Simon reference teaches that the container with the cap thereon is taken from a location where the cap is inherently placed onto the container to the closing station by the use of a conveyor (18). Furthermore to the extent that one might argue that Simon does not teach moving the container to a cap feeding station where a cap is placed on a threaded end of the container, applicant's admitted prior art teaches that a technique of moving a container to a cap feeding station where a cap is placed on a threaded end of the container, followed by taking the container together with the cap to a closing station where the cap is screwed to the container is notoriously old and well known in the packaging art. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art, at the time applicant's invention was made, to have modified the Spatz et al. method by having substituted moving a container to a cap feeding station where a cap is placed on a threaded end of the container, followed by taking the container together with the cap to a closing station where the cap is screwed to the container, for the stationary placing of the cap in the chuck by the pick method at the closing station, as suggested by Simon or by the notoriously old and well known technique, in order to speed up production by conveying the containers and caps.

Finally, note that Spatz et al. discloses both detecting torque during selected number of turns (col. 5, first paragraph) by the use of angle of rotation presetting, or detecting torque during selected time period (col. 4, last paragraph) by the use of timing member presetting. Note that claims 9 and 11 make use of alternative language, and it is only necessary for the prior art to satisfy one of the conditions of the alternative claim language; it is not necessary for the prior art to satisfy both conditions of the alternative claim language.

Regarding claim 12, Spatz et al. discloses electrical signals are generated and using an elongation measuring strip system (DMS) for torque sensing, but does not disclose using a transducer. Simon discloses that the torque sensor (23) is a transducer. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art, at the time applicant's invention was made, to have modified the Spatz et al. machine by having substituted a transducer for the elongation measuring strip system (DMS) as such would have been an obvious matter of design choice to a skilled artisan in the packaging art, and since applicant has not disclosed that a transducer as the torque sensor solves any stated problem or is for any particular purpose and it appears that the invention would perform equally well with other types of torque sensors.

**6.** Claims 13 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable either one of Spatz et al. (**US 5,321,935**) or Simon (**DE 19521924**), in view of Oshima (**JP 2009-81387**).

Either one of the Spatz et al. machine or the Simon machine fails to disclose the type of motor used or that it is a positional controlled electric motor (claim 13) or a

brushless induction motor (claim 14). The Oshima reference teaches that it is old and well known in the relevant art to make use of an electric servo-motor (which is known to a person skilled in the art as a positional controlled electric motor or otherwise known as a brushless induction motor) for screwing a cap to a container where torque control is important, and accurate measuring and control of the motor is desirable. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art, at the time applicant's invention was made, to have further modified either one of the Spatz et al. machine or the Simon machine by having substituted an electric servo-motor (known as a positional controlled electric motor or otherwise known as a brushless induction motor), as suggested by Oshima, for the motor thereof as such would have been an obvious matter of design choice to a skilled artisan for the self-evident benefit of providing accurate measuring and control of the motor. Furthermore, applicant has not disclosed that using a positional controlled motor or brushless induction motor solves any stated problem or is for any particular purpose and it appears that the invention would perform equally well with other types of controllable electric motors.

### **Response to Arguments**

7. Applicant's arguments filed 29 November 2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant argues that new independent claims 9 and 11 included subject matter based on old claims 1 and 3, and as such the prior art applied in the previous Office action cannot anticipate or render unpatentable as obvious the subject matter of claims 9-14. This is not agreed with by the examiner because the independent claims 9 and 11 make use of alternative language. This alternative

language does not render the claims indefinite and is permissible, but the claims are rejectable under 102 and 103 when one of the conditions of the alternative language is met. Accordingly, the prior art applied in the previous Office action is again applied against the new claims 9-14 as set forth above.

### **Conclusion**

**8. THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

**9.** Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Stephen F. Gerrity whose telephone number is 571-272-4460. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday from 6:30 - 3:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Rinaldi Rada can be reached on 571-272-4467. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.



Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Stephen F. Gerrity/  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 3721

7 February 2008